

Mitchell School District Improvement Plan/Progress Report Form

Principle: 1 – General Supervision

Present levels: (Statement of present levels of performance that resulted in area of non-compliance)

ARSD 24:05:22:03. Certified child

A certified child is a child in need of special education or special education and related services who has received a multidisciplinary evaluation and has an individual education program formulated and approved by a local placement committee. Documentation supporting a child's disabling condition as defined by Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act must be maintained by the school district for verification of its annual federal child count. This definition applies to all eligible children ages 3 to 21, inclusive, and to only those children under the age of 3 who are in need of prolonged assistance.

The review team identified the following issues:

1. An evaluation conducted in February of 2004 did not yield sufficient data to support the placement of this student under the eligibility category of Autism. The Gilliam Rating Scale (GARS) rated the student in a "below average probability" of Autism. An outside evaluator reviewed the students record and reported on April 23, 2004 that, "educational needs would be understood and addressed as a manifestation of a diagnosis of an Autistic Disorder. This student does not meet the South Dakota eligibility criteria as a student with autism."
2. The review of a student's record in April of 2004 resulted in a diagnosis of Autism. The record did not include evaluation data sufficient to support this diagnosis. There was no evidence standardized Autism evaluations had been conducted. The student was placed on the 2004 child count as a student with Autism.
3. The Gilliam Rating Scale was administered for another student identified as Autistic on the 2004 child count. The report indicated "the probability of Autism is in the below average range correspondence to the diagnostic criteria for Autism Disorder". In April of 2004, a review of the file was conducted by an outside evaluator. The evaluation reports do not support the South Dakota eligibility criteria for a student with Autism. The student was placed on the 2004 child count as a student with Autism.
4. An evaluation conducted for another student resulted in identification and placement of the student on the 2004 child count as orthopedically impaired. The evaluation data does not support educational impact and the program only requires assignment completion and organizing a planner. Also, evaluation data does not support the criteria for occupational therapy services.
5. An evaluation conducted with a student in 2002 does not support the disability determination of Other Health Impaired. There was no evidence of ability or documentation of the chronic or acute health problem. This student may be eligible under another disability category.
6. An evaluation conducted in 2002 did not provide sufficient medical data to support the eligibility category of Other Health Impaired. This student may be eligible under another disability category.

4 month reporting date 3/09/06 received 3/13/06
 8 month reporting date 7/09/06 received 7/06/06
 IPPR closed 7/07/06

Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families.

The district ensures evaluation data is available to support the students reported disability.

Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. **(Multiple goals may be identified for each principle. Please complete a new sheet for each goal.)**

All evaluation areas for a suspected disability area will be administered and used to support the student's reported disability.

Short Term Objectives: Include the specific measurable results that will be accomplished and the criteria that will be used to measure the results.	Timeline for Completion	Person(s) Responsible	Date Met (For SEP use only)
<p>1. What will the district do to improve? Prior notice/consent will be acquired for tests that are administered in all areas of suspected disability.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The district will review 50% of the initial evaluations and reevaluations occurring during the 4 month reporting period. The district will report the total number of files reviewed and the number of files containing consent for all evaluations administered in the areas of the suspected disability.</p>	June 9, 2006	Special education director, all certified special education personnel (e.g., teachers, speech pathologists, PT/OT)	Met 3/13/06
<p>Please explain the data (4 month) Sixteen evaluation files were reviewed. 100% of the files contained consents for all evaluations administered in the areas of the suspected disability.</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (8 month) Met 3/13/06</p>			

4 month reporting date 3/09/06 received 3/13/06
 8 month reporting date 7/09/06 received 7/06/06
 IPPR closed 7/07/06

Please explain the data (12 month)			
<p>2. What will the district do to improve? Documentation supporting a child's disabling condition will be available for 100% of special education students.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The district will review 50% of the initial evaluations and reevaluations occurring during the reporting period. The district will report the total number of files reviewed and the number of files that contain all evaluations necessary to support the student's disability category as reported on child count.</p>	June 9, 2006	Special education director, all certified special education personnel (e.g., teachers, speech pathologists, PT/OT)	Met 3/13/06
<p>Please explain the data (4 month) Sixteen evaluation files were reviewed. 100% of the files contained all the evaluations necessary to support the student's disability category on the child count. The areas of disability reviewed were 510-Mental Disability, 525-Specific Learning Disability, 550-Speech/Language, 555-Other Health Impaired, 560-Autism and 570-Developmental Disability.</p>			
Please explain the data (8 month)			
Met 3/13/06			
Please explain the data (12 month)			

4 month reporting date 3/09/06 received 3/13/06
 8 month reporting date 7/09/06 received 7/06/06
 IPPR closed 7/07/06

<p>3. What will the district do to improve? The district will review each of the 6 student files above and take steps to ensure each student is reported in the appropriate disability category and that evaluation data is available in the educational record.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The district will submit to SEP a written summary of the step taken to correct the issues for each student above and the outcome of the action. This may include reevaluation, the need for additional evaluation, re-determining eligibility etc. The document verifying eligibility for each student will be submitted to SEP.</p>	<p>February 1, 2006</p>	<p>Special education director, all certified special education personnel (e.g., teachers, speech pathologists, PT/OT</p>	<p>Met 7/06/06</p>
<p>Please explain the data (4 month) The district is reviewing the files of the six students. On students one through three the GARS is going to be given again to determine if they gain a score that supports "probable Autism". Contained in the file is documentation of the state eligibility area of Autism that was reviewed and supported by the team through documentation by observation at the eligibility meeting. Students four and five are in the process of reevaluation to determine eligibility. Student six has completed a reevaluation and eligibility is supported for 525-Specific Learning Disability, a change from 555-Other Health Impaired.</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (8 month) The district reviewed the files of the six students and completed further evaluations or reevaluations as deemed necessary to support a disability category. At the end of the IPPR you will find a specific report stating specific information regarding each student. Eligibility categories were as follows: student one-560-Autism supported, student two-525-Specific Learning Disability supported, student three-560-Autism supported, student four-no longer eligible for special education and/or related services, student five-510-Mental Retardation supported, and student six-525-Specific Learning Disability supported.</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (12 month)</p>			

4 month reporting date 3/09/06 received 3/13/06
 8 month reporting date 7/09/06 received 7/06/06
 IPPR closed 7/07/06

Principle: 3 – Evaluation			
<p>Present levels: (Statement of present levels of performance that resulted in area of non-compliance)</p> <p><u>ARSD 24:05:25:04. Evaluation procedures</u></p> <p>School districts shall ensure, at a minimum, that evaluation procedures include the following:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">(5) A variety of assessment tools and strategies are used to gather relevant functional and development information about the child, including information provided by the parents that may assist in determining:</p> <p style="margin-left: 80px;">(a) Whether the child is a child with a disability; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 80px;">(b) The content of the child's IEP.</p> <p>Through a review of 20 student files the monitoring team found functional assessment was not available to develop the IEP, information from the functional assessment did not include skills needed to develop annual goals or was taken from standardized testing used to determine eligibility.</p>			
<p>Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families.</p> <p>The district ensures the evaluation or reevaluation procedures and instruments meet the minimum requirements.</p>			
<p>Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. (Multiple goals may be identified for each principle. Please complete a new sheet for each goal.)</p> <p>The district will include a written summary of functional information in the evaluation report and use this information to develop the IEP.</p>			
Short Term Objectives: Include the specific measurable results that will be accomplished and the criteria that will be used to measure the results.	Timeline for Completion	Person(s) Responsible	Date Met (For SEP use only)

4 month reporting date 3/09/06 received 3/13/06
 8 month reporting date 7/09/06 received 7/06/06
 IPPR closed 7/07/06

<p>1. What will the district do to improve? For each evaluation, the special education staff will conduct functional assessments in the eligible disability areas within in the 25 day time frame and summarize the functional data in the evaluation report to be used to develop the IEP.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The district will review 50% of the initial evaluations and reevaluations occurring during the reporting period. The district will report the total number of files reviewed, and the number of functional assessments included in the assessment reports.</p>	<p>June 9, 2006</p>	<p>Special education director, all certified special education personnel (e.g., teachers, speech pathologists, PT/OT)</p>	<p>Met 7/07/06</p>
<p>Please explain the data (4 month) All case facilitators were instructed on the use of functional assessments through a department meeting and given samples and templates to use when writing their reports. Overall assessment reports reviewed were more thorough and included the necessary information regarding functional assessment of the students evaluated.</p> <p>Sixteen evaluation files were reviewed. 88% of the files contained information from functional assessments. Of the two that contained evaluation reports that did not specifically list the functional assessment the Special Education Director met individually with the two case facilitators and reviewed the assessments used. They had used functional assessments during the evaluation process but did not include the name of the assessment in the written report.</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (8 month) Thirteen additional evaluation files were reviewed. 100% of the files contained evaluation reports that also included information from functional assessments. All evaluation reports written by the case facilitators that previously did not include functional assessments were included in this data review.</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (12 month)</p>			

Principle: 5 – Individual Education Program

Present levels: (Statement of present levels of performance that resulted in area of non-compliance)

ARSD 24:05:27:01.03. Content of individualized education program

Each student's individualized education program shall include:

- (1) A statement of the student's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, including:
 - (a) How the student's disability affects the student's involvement and progress in the general education curriculum (i.e., the same curriculum as for non-disabled students); or
 - (b) For preschool student, as appropriate, how the disability affects the student's participation in appropriate activities;
- (2) A statement of measurable annual goals, including benchmarks or short-term objectives, related to:
 - (a) Meeting the student's needs that result from the student's disability to enable the student to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum; and
 - (b) Meeting each of the student's other educational needs that result from the student's disability.
- 3) A statement of the special education and related services and supplementary aids and services, based on peer-reviewed research to the extent practicable, to be provided to the student, or on behalf of the student, and a statement of the program modifications or supports for school personnel that will be provided for the student:
 - (a) To advance appropriately toward attaining the annual goals;
 - (b) To be involved and progress in the general education curriculum in accordance with this section and to participate in extracurricular and other nonacademic activities.

The monitoring team reviewed the IEPs for six other students. The programs for these students have not been developed to confer benefit to the student and enable the student to be involved and progress in the general curriculum. For example:

1. The IEP for a student identified as other health impaired due to attention deficit disorder did not address how the student's behavior impacted education. The only goal for this student was to complete assignment with a "C" or better.
2. The IEP for a student identified as learning disabled in the areas of reading, listening comprehension and written expression only contained a goal to write effectively for different audiences.
3. The IEP for a student identified as leaning disabled in the area of math. Special education services to be provided states "goals and objectives will be monitored by the regular classroom teachers and special services. Time=0 minutes."

Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families.

1. The district ensures the IEP contains all required content.

4 month reporting date 3/09/06 received 3/13/06
 8 month reporting date 7/09/06 received 7/06/06
 IPPR closed 7/07/06

Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. **(Multiple goals may be identified for each principle. Please complete a new sheet for each goal.)**

The present levels of performance will contain the student's strengths, needs and effect of the disability on the student's involvement/progress in the general curriculum. Annual goals and short term objectives will be written for each area of the student's disability linked to the functional skills in the present levels of performance.

Short Term Objectives: Include the specific measurable results that will be accomplished and the criteria that will be used to measure the results.	Timeline for Completion	Person(s) Responsible	Date Met (For SEP use only)
<p>1. What will the district do to improve? The district staff will participate in staff development to review the procedures for writing present levels of performance including functional skills and writing goals and objectives which link to the present levels of performance and confer benefit to the student and enable the student to be involved and progress in the general curriculum.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The district will review 2 IEPs from each case facilitator during the 6 month reporting period. The district will report the total number of IEPs reviewed and the number of IEP areas addressed; present levels of performance contain functional skills, goals and objectives linked to the present levels of performance and services are appropriate for disability area.</p>	<p>February 1, 2006 staff development</p> <p>June 9, 2006</p>	<p>Special education director, all certified special education personnel (e.g., teachers, speech pathologists, PT/OT)</p>	<p>Met 7/07/06</p>
<p>Please explain the data (4 month) All case facilitators were instructed on the procedures of writing present levels of performance including functional skills and writing goals and objectives which link to the present levels of performance through a department meeting. In 30 random checks of the 95 IEPs since December 2005, 90% of the present levels of performance and goals and objectives that link to the student needs have improved greatly. I have met with three staff members to review the process addressing the specific areas to improve.</p>			

4 month reporting date 3/09/06 received 3/13/06
8 month reporting date 7/09/06 received 7/06/06
IPPR closed 7/07/06

Please explain the data (8 month)

Over the past 8 months more than 2 IEPs have been reviewed from each case facilitator in the district. Of the 30 random checks of the 103 IEPs since March 2006, 100% of the present levels of performance and goals and objectives link to the student specific skill need as identified through the functional assessment and student's present levels of performance. The services, goals and objectives written in the IEP were appropriate for the students' disabilities. Random checks will continue as IEPs are written.

Please explain the data (12 month)

Principle: 5 – Individual Education Program

Present levels: (Statement of present levels of performance that resulted in area of non-compliance)

[ARSD 24:05:27:01.03. Content of individualized education program](#)

Each student's individualized education program shall include:

(4) An explanation of the extent, if any, to which the student will not participate with non-disabled students in the regular class and in activities described in this section.

Through a review of 17 student records, the justification for placement did not include an explanation of why the student could not participate with his non-disabled peers. For example, "we accept placement in the general classroom".

Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families.

2. The district ensures the IEP contains all required content.

Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. **(Multiple goals may be identified for each principle. Please complete a new sheet for each goal.)**

The justification for placement will specify the student's instructional needs that resulted in the student's removal from the regular classroom and their peers.

4 month reporting date 3/09/06 received 3/13/06
 8 month reporting date 7/09/06 received 7/06/06
 IPPR closed 7/07/06

Short Term Objectives: Include the specific measurable results that will be accomplished and the criteria that will be used to measure the results.	Timeline for Completion	Person(s) Responsible	Date Met (For SEP use only)
<p>1. What will the district do to improve? The justification for placement statement will be written in a reject/accept format that will describe the student's instructional needs; document data that clarifies the need for removal from the regular classroom and his/her peers.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The district will review 2 IEPs from each case facilitator during the reporting period. The district will report the total number of files reviewed and the total number of the files which include a justification statement in a reject/accept format that describes the students' instructional needs that resulted in removal from the regular classroom and their peers.</p>	June 9, 2006	Special education director, all certified special education personnel (e.g., teachers, speech pathologists, PT/OT)	Met 3/13/06
<p>Please explain the data (4 month) All case facilitators were instructed on the procedures of writing justification through a department meeting. A template of examples supplied by the SEP was also given to each case facilitator. 30 IEPs have been reviewed from 24 case facilitators. 100% of the files contained justification statements that included the reject/accept format that describes the student's instructional needs that resulted in removal from the regular classroom and their peers.</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (8 month) Met 3/13/06</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (12 month)</p>			

4 month reporting date 3/09/06 received 3/13/06
 8 month reporting date 7/09/06 received 7/06/06
 IPPR closed 7/07/06

Principle 2-Objective 3-Student Eligibility Information

Student	Child Count Disability	Evals Needed	Eval Given	Results	MDT Report	Disability Supported
BC	560-Autism	Ability	WPPSI-III	73	completed	560-Autism Supported
		Academic-4/04	TERA, TEMA	deficits	5/23/2006	
	<i>GARS stated student was in "below average probability" of autism</i>	Speech/Language-4/04	PLS,			
		Adaptive Behavior	Vineland-4/04	low skills		
		Social Skills	Vineland-4/04	low skills		
		Behavior	BASC-4/04	clinically significant		
			Connors	significant		
			GARS-4/06	90, 104, 109-support autism		
		Observation	Staff-5/06	Eligibility checklist supported 6 of 12 Autism characteristics		
		Observation	Merzer-4/04	DSM-IV criteria used-supported autism		
MF	560-Autism	Ability	WPPSI-III	82	completed	525-SLD Supported
		Academic	OWLS,TERA,TEMA	deficits	12/17/2004	
	<i>no GARS to support autism</i>	Speech/Language	TOLD,PLS,PPVT, 7	deficits	5/23/2006	
		Adaptive Behavior	Vineland	moderately low		
		Social Skills	Vineland	moderately low		
		Behavior	BASC-5/03	significant		
		OT	VMI, B&O	-2.1, -1.0		
		Autism Scale	ADOS-5/03	did not meet cutoff for autism		
		Autism Scale	CARS-5/03	mild/moderate autistic range		
		Autism Scale	GARS-4/06	50, 63, 94 scores-borderline		
		Observation	Merzer-4/04	DSM-IV criteria used-supported autism		
KP	560-Autism	Ability	K-ABC	86-Mental Proc	completed	560-Autism Supported
		Academic	OWLS,TERA,TEMA	deficits	4/21/2005	
	<i>GARS stated student "the probability of Autism is in the below average range correspondence to the diagostic criteria for Autism Disorder</i>	Speech/Language	TOLD, PLS, ASSET	deficits	5/23/2006	
		Adaptive Behavior	Vineland	low skills		
		Social Skills	Vineland	low skills		
		Behavior	BASC	at risk		

4 month reporting date 3/09/06 received 3/13/06
 8 month reporting date 7/09/06 received 7/06/06
 IPPR closed 7/07/06

		PT	B & O	-2.0		
		OT	B&O, VMI	-1.6, -2.4		
		Autism Scale	GARS-4/06	63, 98, 98 scores-support autism		
		Observation	Merzer-4/04	DSM-IV criteria used-supported autism		
		Observation	Staff-5/06	Eligibility checklist supported 8 of 12 Autism characteristics		
KW	535-Orthopedic Impairment	Ability	WISC-IV-FS-84,P-100	V-73, P-79, WM-104	completed	No Longer Qualifies
		Academic	KTEA	average skills 86-100	4/26/2006	
	<i>evaluation data does not support educational impact and the program only required assignment completion and organizing a planner-evaluation data doesn't support OT services</i>	Fine Motor	VMI, MVPT, Sch Func	-1.2, average skills		
		Medical Data	from file	born with "limbs formed		
				in a ball", frequent surgeries		
consent to reeval				to straighten limbs,		
2/15/2006				distal arthrogryposis		
4/26/2006						
*student out for						
surgery/recovery						
TN	510-Mentally Disabled	Ability	WISC-IV	54	completed	510-MR Supported
		Speech/Language	OWLS,TOWK	deficits	3/7/2006	
		Academic	WIAT	deficits		
reeval done	<i>new category</i>	Health Problems	ADHD-DCI report??			
meeting 3/7/2006		Behavior	Connors	significant areas		
		Adaptive	Hawthorne	weak skill areas		
		Social Skills	Hawthorne	weak area		
TC	525-Specific LD	Ability-2/3/06	WIS-IV	105	completed	525-SLD Supported
		Academic-1/5/06	WIAT	Reading-79	2/13/2006	
		Observation-2/9/06	JU			
reeval done	<i>new category</i>					
meeting 2/13/2006						